REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the pending application. The Office Action dated November 28. 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-17 are rejected.

The Office Actions rejects claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to Tajima et al and rejects claims 1-8, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admission of prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,608 to Springer, U.S. Patent No. 6,778,160 to Kubota et al and U.S. Patent No. 6,697,250 to Kuo.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 to further define the invention and deleted claim 6. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-17 are presently pending. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C 102(b)

The claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to Tajima et al (hereafter "Tajima"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

By this response, claim 9 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because "Tajima" fails to teach or suggest each and every element in the claim 9. In particular, Claim 9 is allowable over "Tajima" in that claim 9 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "implementing a second picture including a first area and a second area for the second field, wherein the second picture for the second field has a different brightness level in accordance with a type of image display than a brightness level of the first picture for the first field". "Tajima" does not disclose at least implementing a second picture including a first area and a second area for the second field, wherein the second picture for the second field has a different brightness level in accordance with a type of image display than a brightness level of the first picture for the first field. Furthermore, "Tajima" relates to a Plasma Display Panel, especially an intraframe time-division multiplexing type Plasma Display Panel. See Figs. 1-3, 7, and 9 and also see col. 1 line 40 to col. 2 line 7 col. 11 lines 1-34, and col. 12 line 64 to col. 13 line 42 in the specification. For example, Figs. 5 and 6 show a block diagram which shows a plasma display device which is one example an intraframe time-division multiplexing type display device, and reference No. 72 means "Plasma Display Panel Timing Generation Circuit Section". Therefore, "Tajima" fails to disclose at least a driving method of a liquid crystal display. For at least these reasons, claim 9 is patentable over "Tajima".

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C 103(a)

The claims 1-8, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admission of prior art (hereinafter "AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,608 to Springer (hereinafter "Springer"), U.S. Patent No.

6,778,160 to Kubota et al (hereinafter "Kubota") and U.S. Patent No. 6,697,250 to Kuo (hereinafter "Kuo"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The claims 1 is allowable over "AAPA" in view of "Springer" in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a timing controller realigning the data and the processed data; a data driver supplying the realigned data and the processed data to the data lines; and a gate driver supplying a scan pulse to the gate lines". None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In addition, claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display including, in part, a video processor generating processed data to implement a brightness level at a specific area of the liquid crystal display panel that is different from a remaining area of the liquid crystal display panel and a position designator designating the specific area of the liquid crystal display panel where the processed data is implemented and a position designator designating the specific area of the liquid crystal display panel where the processed data is implemented.

The Office equates VSP 150 in the graphic controller 145 of "Springer" with the claimed video processor. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display including a video processor. The VSP 150 is equipped on the main board of computer system 100, not monitor 80.

Further, the Office equates the claimed position designator with the graphic controller 145 of "Springer". However, the graphic controller 145 of "Springer" is equipped on the main board of the computer system 100, not in the CRT display device 80.

Claim 7 is allowable over "AAPA" in view of "Springer" in that claim 7 recites

a liquid crystal display including, in part, a video processor generating processed data for the specific area from the position data and data such that the brightness level of the processed data for the specific area is different than the brightness level of the data and a timing controller realigning the data and the processed data.

As discussed above, the VSP 150 is equipped on the main board of the computer system 100, not monitor 80. Therefore, the VSP 150 does not communicate with a timing controller of monitor 80.

Further, in "Springer", as the computer system 100 supplies the data to the CRT 80, it is not required to have data relating to the pixel structure of the LCD panel. Accordingly, "Springer" does not include at least a timing controller for rearranging the processed data as recited in claim 7.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P.§2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because applicant's related art "AAPA" or "Springer", where taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 7, the rejection under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The claims 11-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "AAPA", "Springer", "Kubota", and "Kuo" as applied to claims 1-8, 10 and 14 above, and further in view of Tajima. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over "AAPA" in view of "Springer" in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a timing controller realigning the data and the processed data; a data driver supplying the realigned data and the processed data to the data lines; and a gate driver supplying a

scan pulse to the gate lines". None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The claims 11-13 and 15-17 which variously depend on claim1 are also allowable over "AAPA", "Springer", "Kubota", and "Kuo" and further in view of Tajima at least for same reasons as for claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersignd representive to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis& Bockius LLP

Dated: February 28, 2008 By: Mary Jane Boswell

Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Customer No. 09629
Morgan, Lewis& Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 2004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3100